

HANA HILSEN RATH  
OLIVER HILSEN RATH  
822 Eastbrook Court  
Danville, CA 94506  
Telephone: 925 212 6299  
Facsimile: 925 736 7571  
ohlx@sbcglobal.net

PLAINTIFFS IN PRO PER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HANA HILSEN RATH, OLIVER  
HILSEN RATH, NAMA HILSEN RATH,  
LIOR HILSEN RATH, ELLA HOPE  
HILSEN RATH, ISAIAH BENJAMIN  
HILSEN RATH, SAUL NATHANIEL  
HILSEN RATH, THE LIVING TRUST OF  
MELANIE AND ANDRE HILSEN RATH,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE SWISS CONFEDERATION, THE  
FEDERAL ATTORNEY GENERAL OF  
SWITZERLAND, GERARD SAUTEBIN,  
BRENT HOLTKAMP, AND DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

ORIGINAL  
FILED  
JULY 29 PM 3:22  
RICHARD W. WILKINS  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

E-filing

MMC

C 07 2782

COMPLAINT FOR THE DEPRIVATION OF  
RIGHT FOR LIBERTY, OF RIGHT TO  
PROPERTY, AND OF THE RIGHT TO  
CIVIL FREEDOMS GRANTED BY THE  
4<sup>TH</sup>, 5<sup>TH</sup> AND THE 6<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT OF  
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED  
STATES OF AMERICA

INTRODUCTION

1. This current complaint is respectfully submitted in pro per by  
plaintiffs Hana and Oliver Hilsenrath, US citizens and  
residents of the state of California, as the result of  
defendants' 3<sup>rd</sup> year freeze of plaintiffs' assets, turning  
hired legal representation inaccessible.

Exh. D

- 1 2. The Swiss Confederation and the other defendants in this
- 2 complaint froze plaintiffs' assets in 8 foreign countries
- 3 alleging that those assets were the result of theft.
- 4 3. The theft is alleged to have occurred in the United States,
- 5 specifically in the northern district of California.
- 6 4. The US government investigated the alleged theft, having
- 7 allegedly occurred on American soil, and determined that the
- 8 assets were legitimately obtained.
- 9 5. The US government and federal court in California stated in
- 10 dozens of letters and orders to defendants that the freeze of
- 11 plaintiffs' assets is unjustified.
- 12 6. The Swiss Confederation made abundant use of the international
- 13 treaties with the US to investigate and effect the freeze.
- 14 7. The Swiss chose, however, not to comply with the same
- 15 international treaties when the US government ordered the
- 16 Swiss that the freeze is wrongful, and plaintiffs' assets
- 17 should be released.
- 18 8. In a series of actions, the Swiss, defendants in this case,
- 19 continue for the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, now, to freeze assets, diminish
- 20 their value, defame the plaintiffs, and violate their
- 21 constitutional right to property.
- 22 9. To further deter plaintiffs from pursuing their just right to
- 23 property, defendant Swiss confederation issued, with no
- 24 intelligible purpose, an international arrest warrant to the
- 25 181 nations - members of the Interpol - for the arrest of
- 26 Oliver Hilsenrath.
- 27 10. Defendants, Swiss authorities, acted in self-interest, and in
- 28 breach of civil liberties.
11. No charges or any other formal complaints were ever filed
- against the Hilsenraths.

1 12. Defendants, Swiss authorities, exercised baseless, cruel and  
2 unusual collective punishment on the sizable Hilsenrath  
3 family. The Swiss were well aware that the frozen assets are  
4 jointly owned by the Hilsenraths and that the Hilsenraths care  
5 for 6 children, mostly minors.

6 13. By so acting, the Swiss Confederation, their employees,  
7 instrumentalities and cooperators have not only harmed the  
8 plaintiffs, but also disturbed the balance on which  
9 international law and international legal treaties are  
10 regulating the world economy and human rights.

11 14. Plaintiffs seek to have their assets restored after the 3-  
12 year-long damage by defendants.

13 15. Plaintiffs also seek to be compensated by defendants for all  
14 losses, damages and expenses incurred.

#### 15 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

16 16. Plaintiffs 1-7 are citizens of the United States and residents  
17 of California, while defendants are a foreign sovereign and  
18 mostly residents of foreign states.

19 17. The Federal court has jurisdiction over this case and the  
20 venue in the Northern District of California is adequate  
21 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1330§, 1331, § 1332.

22 18. Defendants seized and diminished the value of property of US  
23 citizens<sup>1</sup>.

---

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> Shaffer v. Heitner, 433 U.S. 186 (1977): [T]he property alone provides a  
26 sufficient contact for a court having jurisdiction over that geographic area to  
27 adjudicate claims relating to the ownership of the property, or relating to  
28 injuries which occurred there. In that case, the jurisdiction exercised by the  
court is referred to *in rem* jurisdiction (i.e. jurisdiction over the thing),  
instead of *in personam* jurisdiction.

**DEFERENCE TO PLAINTIFF'S FORUM**

19. The US federal jurisdiction is appropriate in this case.

Deference to the plaintiff's forum is a stronger consideration where the plaintiff is an American citizen, especially in this current case in which the underlying claims arose under United States law (wrongful allegations that an improper act occurred on US soil and then extended to Switzerland).

20. "The rule of deference to Plaintiff's forum is not intended to disadvantage foreign plaintiffs but rather reflects a realistic prediction of the ultimate convenience of the forum." [*Piper Aircraft*, 454 U.S. at 254.] This is particularly true here where defendants' case is entirely based on actions that occurred on US soil. The evidence, witnesses, experts, relevant members of the US government, etc. are all in the northern district of California.

21. Defendants have permanent legal and commercial representation in the USA and have legal attaché in both San Francisco as well as in other States of the Union.

22. Plaintiff does not have an alternate forum. In Switzerland plaintiffs cannot self-represent. Plaintiffs could not hire attorneys in Switzerland as the result of the ongoing freeze of their assets by the Swiss defendants themselves.

**EXCEPTION TO SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY OF DEFENDANT SWISS CONFEDERATION**

23. It is expected that defendant Swiss Confederation will waive both its immunity and the need for service in relation with the present complaint as defendants have initiated legal action against plaintiffs-citizens of the USA-by reliance on the US-Swiss legal treaty. [28 U.S.C.S §1605 a(1)]

1 24. It was assessed that a sovereign may implicitly waive its  
2 immunity for such violations, as violations of human rights,  
3 when it ratifies such rights in the first place<sup>2</sup>.

4 25. It is also expected that defendants will respond with the same  
5 courtesy to plaintiff's Oliver Hilsenrath repeated and  
6 unconditioned waiver of rights when traveling from California  
7 to Switzerland for questioning on two separate occasions at  
8 the invitation of defendants in this action.

9 26. Nevertheless, if defendant Swiss Confederation will invoke  
10 immunity of a foreign state, such immunity<sup>3</sup> will not stand  
11 pursuant to 28 U.S.C.S. § 1605 and § 1607.

12 27. Furthermore, (a) the 2 banks involved are defendants'  
13 instrumentality; (b) the 2 banks have solicited and continue  
14 to solicit business in the United States (c) defendant  
15 interfered with plaintiff's business in the same banks; (d)  
16 defendants and their instrumentalities have breached  
17 plaintiffs constitutional rights, specifically the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and  
18 6<sup>th</sup> amendments; (e) plaintiffs and their instrumentalities  
19 disobeyed several specific orders of the District Court in the

---

20 <sup>2</sup> "A number of legal scholars have examined this principle in the context  
21 of human rights violations, and have concluded that a sovereign may implicitly  
22 waive its immunity for such violations when it ratifies human rights agreements."  
23 R. Lillich and F. Newman, *International Human Rights: Problems of Law and Policy*  
24 (1979); Comment, *The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act and International Human*  
25 *Rights Agreements: How They Co-Exist*, 17 U.S.F. L. Rev. 71 (1982).

26 <sup>3</sup> Cassirer v. Kingdom of Spain, 461 F. Supp. 2d 1157: -- "taken in violation of  
27 international law" contains no limitation on a court's exercise of jurisdiction  
28 to sovereigns that were involved in the initial taking, and no such limitation  
should be implied.

Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act cases have examined the meaning of the phrase  
"property taken in violation of international law" and have held that if a taking  
violates any one of the following proscriptions, it violates international law.  
These proscriptions include injury resulting from: (1) a taking by the state of  
the property of a national of another state that: (a) is not for a public  
purpose, or (b) is discriminatory, or (c) is not accompanied by provision for  
just compensation.

subject matter<sup>4</sup>; (f) plaintiffs and their instrumentalities - the banks - wish to do business in the United States while at the same time violating the US constitution and acting against US Federal court orders.

### THE PARTIES

#### **Plaintiffs**

28. Plaintiffs 1 to 7 are United States citizens and residents of the State of California.

- Plaintiffs 1 and 2, Hana and Oliver Hilsenrath are both scientists with high academic degrees.
- Hana Hilsenrath has devoted her last 25 years solely to raising the family's 6 children and had at no time, any involvement in Mr. Hilsenrath's businesses.
- Plaintiffs 3 to 7 are the children of the Hilsenrath couple. Plaintiffs 4 to 7 are minors.

---

<sup>4</sup>21 August 2006 Order-District Court: "The United States federal government has now concluded that these frozen assets were not embezzled or stolen. The United States Federal government has also concluded that these frozen assets were not the proceeds of a securities fraud offense.

The Court requests that the Swiss investigating magistrates withdraw their requests for freezes made to other European jurisdictions."

13 Nov 2006 Order-District Court: "The Court clarifies that there is no other mechanism (other than the issuance of this order) to pronounce on the propriety of the asset freeze. If the assets had been frozen in the United States, and the Court issued a similar order holding that there was no probable cause to freeze the assets, then the assets would have to be released and returned to Mr. Hilsenrath.

The Court asks the Swiss examining magistrates to deem it's August 21, 2006, order a final order, not subject to any other judgment or plea.

Consequently, the Court reiterates its request to the Swiss authorities to release Mr. Hilsenrath's frozen funds and to withdraw their requests for freezes made to other European countries, to the extent that the Swiss authorities' freeze of assets is attributable to their mistaken conclusion that there are violations of U.S. law that justify Swiss money laundering charges."

- Plaintiff 8 represents the liquidated estate of Mr. Hilsenrath's parents assigned originally to the grandchildren.

29. Plaintiffs' assets were unlawfully traced, located and frozen by defendants.

30. The funds of plaintiff number 8 were liquidated against their charter.

31. The liquidated estate of plaintiff 8 was the Hilsenrath family's last source of funds amid the open ended Swiss hold of assets.

#### **Defendants**

32. Defendant Swiss Confederation is a sovereign government on behalf of which The Swiss Federal Attorney General (SFAG), SAUTEBIN and HOLTKAMP are acting.

33. Defendant Swiss Federal Attorney General (SFAG) has formally launched a legal action (including in the United States<sup>5</sup>), a formal investigation, and an international freeze of assets.

34. Defendants Gerard Sautebin (SAUTEBIN) and Brent Holtkamp (HOLTKAMP) are employees of the Swiss Confederation and were/are in charge of the so-called investigation against the Hilsenraths. This investigation in its 3<sup>rd</sup> year, now, is the pretext for the sweeping international search and freeze of assets.

35. Defendants harmed plaintiffs by means of mutual legal assistance treaties - MLAT's), including the MLAT with the United States of America.

36. The Swiss Confederation allowed SAUTEBIN and HOLTKAMP access to its network of MLAT's (Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty), the Hague convention treaties and to the INTERPOL.

---

<sup>5</sup> Proceeding QJIF/VU.2005.18 – [Swiss] Federal Attorney General v. Mr. Oliver HILSEN RATH

1 37. The Swiss treaties with the United States, made it possible to  
2 retrieve documents, access accounts, enact freeze and  
3 forfeiture orders of assets and act beyond Swiss jurisdiction  
4 including in California, and indirectly in other states of the  
5 USA.

6 38. Does 1-10 are other direct and indirect persons materially  
7 acting with or on behalf of defendants 1 to 4 to effect the  
8 freeze of assets, invade plaintiffs privacy, defame plaintiffs  
9 in 8 jurisdictions, including in the United States of America,  
10 manipulate and diminish the value of the aforementioned funds  
11 and assets.

12 39. In spite of the tens of interrogations, international freezes,  
13 destruction of property, international arrest warrants,  
14 defendants (Swiss government) never brought actual charges  
15 against plaintiffs (the Hilsenraths).

16 **DEFENDANTS' COURSE OF CONDUCT**

17 40. In April 2005 the Swiss Confederation initiated a freeze of  
18 assets held by the Hilsenraths in two banks: Credit Suisse and  
19 UBS. Both banks have businesses in both Switzerland and the  
20 United States.

21 41. The Swiss Confederation froze the Hilsenraths' assets under  
22 the pretext that those assets were stolen from a California  
23 based company.

24 42. HOLTKAMP and others, operating on behalf of the Swiss  
25 Confederation, launched a process of seizing documents held by  
26 the two banks and tracing all business relationships in the  
27 history of the Hilsenraths' accounts from 1994 to 2007. The  
28 objective was to freeze assets of alleged partners or co-  
conspirators of the Hilsenraths in at least 8 different  
countries.



1 43. In May 2005, only one month later, HOLTKAMP received his first  
2 transmission of a finding by the District Court in California  
3 that the Hilsenraths' funds in Switzerland are in fact not the  
4 result of an alleged theft.

5 44. In disregard of this information HOLTKAMP and his colleagues  
6 embarked on a process of tracking Hilsenrath business  
7 partners, sending Swiss police agents to persons in/and  
8 outside Switzerland for interrogations and freezing those  
9 persons' assets under alleged suspicion of conspiring with the  
10 Hilsenraths and laundering stolen money.

11 45. In July and August 2005 on two different occasions and at  
12 HOLTKAMP's request, Oliver Hilsenrath traveled from the US for  
13 6 days of interrogation in a closed facility of the Swiss  
14 government in Bern.

15 46. At the end of the above interrogations, HOLTKAMP concluded in  
16 letters to the US and to Hilsenrath, that he received from  
17 Hilsenrath ample information and that he does not have a  
18 reason to believe that the Hilsenraths transferred illegally  
19 obtained assets to Switzerland.

20 47. He promised in those same letters to lift the freeze on assets  
21 within 3 days. The assets remain frozen till this very day, 25  
22 months later.

23 48. In the summer of 2005, while HOLTKAMP was concluding that no  
24 illicit act is likely to have occurred on Swiss soil, two  
25 unidentified agents of the Swiss Confederations visited  
26 several foreign countries to investigate a number of alleged  
27 Hilsenrath money laundry partners (defendants Doe 1 and 2).

28 49. They communicated to local authorities that they are  
investigating an international money laundry ring that has  
transferred over \$11 million of illegally obtained US funds  
through Switzerland.

1 50. The result of that trip was more financial damage: closure of  
2 several additional businesses, revocation of additional lines  
3 of credit to businesses, and significant embarrassment to  
4 plaintiffs in this case.

5 51. Some of the investigated persons on that trip were obligated  
6 to sell personal business assets and deposit large sums in  
7 suspicious, untraceable government accounts.

8 52. Meanwhile, tens of letters and orders were sent to the Swiss  
9 government from the US government and from the California  
10 District Court, beginning January 2006.

11 53. Those letters and orders were stating that the freeze is an  
12 error and it is wrongful.

13 54. The Swiss remained silent. They carefully avoided updating the  
14 8 affected jurisdictions, keeping them in the dark on the US  
15 government findings and messages.

16 55. The funds were never returned to their owners.

#### 17 CHRONOLOGY OF DEFENDANT'S ACTIONS

18 56. In or about May 2005, the Swiss Confederation ordered all  
19 assets of the Hilsenrath's - internationally - to be frozen.  
20 This includes Switzerland and 8 other countries in which the  
21 Hilsenrath's ever transferred funds or made payments.

22 57. In July and in August 2005, Oliver Hilsenrath traveled to  
23 Switzerland and interviewed for 6 days on matters related to  
24 his career, life, business, and family, while supplying  
25 thousands of pages of personal records.

26 58. Swiss investigator HOLTKAMP and his team were satisfied that  
27 the Hilsenraths in Switzerland deposited no proceeds of theft.

28 **59.** On 23 August 2005, immediately pursuing to Oliver Hilsenrath's  
last day of interrogation, HOLTKAMP wrote the following to  
Bjorn Bajan, then Hilsenrath's attorney in this matter:

23 August 2005 - HOLTKAMP to (then)Hilsenrath's attorney:

"I refer to the above-mentioned criminal matter and the interrogations of your client on the 15th and 16th August 2005. I hereby inform you that I will render shortly a formal decision for the lifting of the attachments, the original of which will be transmitted (without foundation and the findings of law) to the foreign authorities, which have been put in place by the Federal Prosecutor following the letterogatory."

60. Till this very day, 22 months after the date of this letter, the assets remain frozen. The mentioned letter was never issued. More assets were traced and frozen after the date of this letter. More businesses shattered, more police raided homes and offices of innocent persons in multiple countries, more assets destroyed - all on orders of defendants' Swiss Confederation.

61. The two-faced Swiss government tactic continued undisturbed. On 29 September 2005, HOLTKAMP wrote another letter, this time to the US Central Authority in Washington DC, reporting that he cannot find anything wrong about the Hilsenrath assets in Switzerland and cannot verify any criminal act at the (American) origins of the Hilsenrath funds:

29 September 2005 - HOLTKAMP to US/Office of International Affairs (OIA)

"Oliver HILSENATH was interviewed on four occasions and has given extensive information and explanations pertaining to his alleged involvement in the criminal activities committed while he was an executive member of U.S. WIRELESS CORPORATION (hereafter USWC), actually bankrupt.

During his interviews he gave a number of responses and provided a large amount of documentation which has been thoroughly

1 reviewed by our financial analyst, who saw no  
2 discrepancies with the facts as stated by  
3 Oliver HILSENDRATH in regards with the sale of  
4 350'000 stocks of USWC and the subsequent  
transfer of the resulting proceeds to Swiss  
bank accounts.

5 The abovementioned analysis, in addition to the  
6 proceedings of April 19, 2005, and your  
7 clarifying and supplemental request to  
8 Switzerland of August 2005, in both of which it  
9 seems to be stated that the 350'000 stocks of  
10 USWC were legitimately acquired and are  
11 therefore not encompassed in the government's  
12 indictment, renders improbable any money-  
13 laundering activity committed in Switzerland.  
This is also due to the fact that the proceeds  
of the afore-mentioned 350'000 stocks account  
for the major amounts of currency transferred  
to Switzerland before being forwarded to other  
States."

14 62. Till this very day, 21 months after the date of this letter,  
the assets remain frozen.

15 63. In December 2005, HOLTKAMP transferred the so-called  
16 investigation and the frozen assts to another Swiss employee,  
17 SAUTEBIN. SAUTEBIN started the questioning of the Hilsenrath  
18 affairs from square one and invited Oliver Hilsenrath to a new  
19 set of interrogation, this time in Geneva in May 2006.  
20 Hilsenrath agreed, as before with HOLTKAMP, to travel and meet  
21 SAUTEBIN. SAUTEBIN kept rescheduling, and purposely avoiding,  
22 the interrogation that ultimately never happened till this  
very day.

23 64. On 2 June 2006, the United States Office of International  
24 Affairs in Washington DC wrote to the Swiss Central Authority:

25 2 June 2006 - US/OIA to Swiss Gov.

26 "Please advise the Swiss authorities that we  
27 are seeking to have the freeze lifted  
28 immediately on all [Hilsenrath] funds."

1 65. SAUTEBIN did not comply with the US information and Court  
2 orders.

3 66. SAUTEBIN instead started at this point to question the  
4 competence of the US government officials that investigated  
5 the propriety of the Hilsenrath transactions.

6 67. In response, the OIA in Washington wrote to SAUTEBIN on 18  
7 July 2006 as follows:

8 18 July 2006 - US/OIA to SAUTEBIN

9       \*\*     \* When we consulted with a securities  
10 expert later, he told us that these disclosures  
11 meant that there was not a problem from the  
12 SEC's perspective with the sale of the stock.  
13 Our expert is a former Commissioner at the  
14 United States Securities and Exchange  
Commission, is a tenured faculty member at one  
of the top three law schools in the United  
States, and sits on the board of directors of a  
major technology company in the United States.

15       \*     \* [T]he Court here has asked that the Swiss  
16 authorities act expeditiously. We would  
17 appreciate knowing as soon as possible -  
preferably by the end of the month - whether  
the Swiss authorities will release the assets."

18  
19 68. The freeze was in its 15<sup>th</sup> month and the crunch on the  
20 Hilsenraths and their partners continued.

21 69. SAUTEBIN replied that he would not remove the freeze unless he  
22 receives from the US government more records on the  
23 Hilsenraths, on top and above the tens of thousands of  
documents transmitted in the (then) year and a half.

24 70. On 31 July 2006, the US Department of Justice replies to the  
25 Swiss with a firm request to release the hold on the  
26 Hilsenrath assets throughout Europe. The US government states  
27 this time firmly: NO more papers...

31 July 2006 - US/OIA to Swiss Gov.

"It is wrong for the Swiss authorities to continue to freeze Mr. Hilsenrath's assets. Justice requires that Mr. Hilsenrath have access to his money so that he can defend himself with the assistance of counsel. I do not understand why the Swiss Examining Magistrate continues - over my objections and over the Court's objections - to freeze Mr. Hilsenrath's money based on a mistaken conclusion by a junior prosecutor that the stock shares were sold in violation of U.S. securities and fraud laws. \* \* \* Again, I ask M. SAUTEBIN to release the assets immediately and to withdraw his holds on the other assets that Mr. Hilsenrath has in Europe.

Mr. SAUTEBIN also asks for more records. I have already given Mr. SAUTEBIN all of the evidence in our possession."

71. The freeze was now in its 15<sup>th</sup> month and no relief to Hilsenrath, his family and partners.
72. The irrational, collective punishment of the Hilsenraths continued.
73. To remove any possible doubt of the proper nature of the Hilsenrath funds transferred in the course of business to Switzerland, Federal District Judge William H. Alsup signed an order pursuant to Civil Rule 65 making a finding as to the proper nature of the Swiss frozen assets. Judge Alsup writes on 21 August 2006 requesting specifically to remove the hold on assets throughout Europe:

21 August 2006 -US/District Court to Swiss Gov.

"The United States federal government has now concluded that these frozen assets were not embezzled or stolen. The United States Federal government has also concluded that these frozen assets were not the proceeds of a securities fraud offense.

1                   The Court requests that the Swiss investigating  
2                   magistrates withdraw their requests for freezes  
3                   made to other European jurisdictions."

4       74. The freeze was now in its 17<sup>th</sup> month. SAUTEBIN turned the US  
5       department of Justice and the District court down again.

6       75. The time was being utilized by SAUTEBIN's people to continue  
7       to force Hilsenraths' partners to sell off joint business  
8       assets and deposit them in obscure government accounts -  
9       governed by equally obscure regulations.

10      76. The US Office of International Affairs wrote to SAUTEBIN again  
11      on 30 October 2006: OIA told SAUTEBIN's this time  
12      (paraphrased) that he is out of line, followed by a  
13      painstaking explanation of US law and procedures and the  
14      breaches of constitutional rights caused by the Swiss actions.

15                   30 Oct 2006 - US/OIA to Swiss Gov.

16                   "With all due respect, that conclusion is  
17                   misplaced. More sophisticated prosecutors have  
18                   now evaluated the case, and the presiding judge  
19                   here (an experienced jurist appointed by the  
20                   President of the United States for a life term)  
21                   agrees that there was no probable cause to  
22                   support the freeze of the assets.

23                   Gerard SAUTEBIN said that he did not intend to  
24                   release the funds at this time because he  
25                   "would like to obtain, previously, a court  
26                   ruling in the matter by the American Authority  
27                   (or a plea agreement) regarding Mr. Oliver  
28                   Hilsenrath." So the Court here issued an order,  
                 just as M. SAUTEBIN requested. Now M. SAUTEBIN  
                 says that the order he requested is not  
                 sufficient because it is not a plea or a  
                 sentencing document. Again, with all due  
                 respect, the order from the federal judge here  
                 is a final order for purposes of the asset  
                 freeze. There is no other mechanism in our  
                 court system to address the issue of a wrongful  
                 freeze. If a judge finds that there is no

1           probable cause to freeze assets, assets are  
2           released.

3           While that is standard textbook law on the  
4           fourth amendment, I will obtain another court  
5           order here saying that."

6 77. With the freeze in its 19<sup>th</sup> month, Federal District Judge  
7 William H. Alsup issues a second order on 13 November 2006,  
8 repeating in unequivocal language: This ruling is final and  
9 binding. The Hilsenrath funds are legitimately obtained. The  
10 Swiss government's freeze of assets in Switzerland and other  
11 countries needs to be removed immediately.

12           13 Nov 2006 - US/District Court to Swiss Gov.

13           "The Court clarifies that there is no other  
14 mechanism (other than the issuance of this  
15 order) to pronounce on the propriety of the  
16 asset freeze. If the assets had been frozen in  
17 the United States, and the Court issued a  
18 similar order holding that there was no probable  
19 cause to freeze the assets, then the assets  
20 would have to be released and returned to Mr.  
21 Hilsenrath.

22           The Court asks the Swiss examining magistrates  
23 to deem it's August 21, 2006, order a final  
24 order, not subject to any other judgment or  
25 plea.

26           Consequently, the Court reiterates its request  
27 to the Swiss authorities to release Mr.  
28 Hilsenrath's frozen funds and to withdraw their  
requests for freezes made to other European  
countries, to the extent that the Swiss  
authorities' freeze of assets is attributable to  
their mistaken conclusion that there are  
violations of U.S. law that justify Swiss money  
laundering charges."

78. In the 20<sup>th</sup> month of the freeze, the Office of International  
affairs in Washington DC wrote to the Swiss Central Authority



1 and to SAUTEBIN again on 30 November 2006, readdressing for  
2 the countless time, the same legitimacy issues of the assets  
3 transferred to Switzerland; asking the freeze to be lifted,  
4 and stating that the US government will not answer further of  
5 the Swiss questions on this matter.

6 30 Nov 2006 - US/OIA to Swiss Gov.

7 "Enclosed is a the letter from the U.S.  
8 Attorney's Office for the Northern District of  
9 California, both reiterating that the court  
10 there has found no basis for freezing the assets  
11 in Switzerland under U.S. law, and that its  
12 orders are the equivalent of a final, binding  
order. The letter also responds to the request  
of the Swiss magistrate for information from the  
SEC related to this matter.

13 \* \* \* The SEC has not asked for any of  
14 Oliver Hilsenrath's assets to be frozen, either  
15 here in the United States or abroad. \* \* \*  
16 Thus, we do not consider any further requests  
17 from the Swiss Examining Magistrate to be  
appropriate, either to the U.S. Attorney's  
Office or to the SEC.

18 We, in support of the U.S. Attorney's office,  
19 have written numerous letters, provided complete  
20 documentation and information, and (as the Swiss  
21 examining magistrate requested) obtained the  
22 court orders verifying that the assets are not  
23 subject to restraint and would be released to  
Mr. Hilsenrath if they were in the United  
States. We therefore ask the Swiss authorities  
to release the assets and to withdraw its holds  
on Mr. Hilsenrath's assets elsewhere in Europe."

24 79. Six more months are passing. The Swiss government did not  
25 release the assets or even allow for the assets to be orderly  
26 managed in violation of Swiss law<sup>6</sup>.

27 <sup>6</sup> Bundesamt für Justiz [Federal Judicial Authority - citing rules to  
28 manage frozen assets]: "The assets must continue to be administered and  
invested according to customary bank principles. In particular existing

- 1 80. The unlawful Swiss sponsored "collection" of funds from  
2 Hilsenraths' partners has continued undisturbed, two years  
3 after the beginning of the freeze.
- 4 81. The large Hilsenrath family struggles under the weight of the  
5 Swiss inexplicable action.
- 6 82. Two years, 24 months into the freeze, the US department of  
7 Justice writes to the Swiss Central Authority and to SAUTEBIN  
8 again on 1 May 2007 to lift the "wrongful" freeze:

9 1 May 2007 - US/OIA to SAUTEBIN

10 "I am writing to follow up on my March 9,  
11 2007 letter responding to the Swiss Examining  
12 Magistrate's letter dated February 27, 2007.  
13 I have not received any reply from the Swiss  
14 authorities about the status of the assets.

15 I once again ask the Swiss Examining  
16 Magistrate to lift the wrongful freeze of Mr.  
17 Hilsenrath's assets. I also would appreciate  
18 a status report about what is happening with  
19 the assets and the Swiss case so that I can  
20 report to the Court here."

- 21 83. At the date of the filing of this complaint, the Swiss unjust  
22 and inexplicable freeze is in its 25<sup>th</sup> month. The Hilsenraths  
23 and tens of others were significantly hurt by the Swiss  
24 action.
- 25 84. Hundreds of thousands of Dollars in legal fees were incurred  
26 during this action before plaintiffs ran out of funds.
- 27 85. The price of the Swiss action:
- 28 86. Tens of Millions of Dollars of lost business assets and  
opportunities in these painful 25 months.
87. Fear and pain inflicted on the Hilsenraths and tens of other  
persons by means of undeserved and inexplicable collective  
punishment.

---

and potential future incoming orders to invest such assets must continue  
to be executed."

1 88. The damage to the Hilsenraths ability to conduct business and  
2 that of their business partners will follow them into more  
3 future personal damage and losses.

4  
5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Collective punishment - violation of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> amendment)**

7 Plaintiffs incorporate each of the above paragraphs by reference.

8 89. Plaintiffs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were deprived by defendants,  
9 Swiss government, of their assets collectively and  
10 indiscriminately.

11 90. Beyond the US constitution, The Forth Geneva Convention  
12 (SAUTEBIN's own headquarters) further supported by article 50  
13 of The Hague Regulations, "forbids collective punishment and  
14 states that a person shall not be punished for an offense he  
15 or she has not personally committed."<sup>7</sup>

16 91. Plaintiffs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were at no time under any  
17 suspicion of any kind by any government including defendants.

18 92. Plaintiffs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were known to the defendants as  
19 being dependents and mostly minors.

20 93. Plaintiffs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were known to defendants as  
21 beneficiaries of the frozen assets.

22 94. Defendants had repeated, clear written notice that Plaintiffs  
23 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, Mrs. Hilsenrath and her 6 children, are  
24 struggling as the result of the defendants freeze.

25 95. Defendants turned plaintiffs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 down on all  
26 pleas for relief.

27  
28  

---

7 Article 33 of the Fourth Geneva Convention forbids collective punishment and states that a person shall not be punished for an offense he or she has not personally committed. This article explicitly relates to administrative punishment imposed on persons or groups because of acts that they did not personally commit. Article 50 of the Hague Regulations states a comparable prohibition.

1 96. Plaintiffs are entitled to this Court's order to compensation  
 2 in the value of all assets traced and/or seized in value of at  
 3 least \$7.3 million and other damages according to proof.

4 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 pray relief as set  
 5 forth below.

## 6 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

7 (Violation of 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> amendment right protecting against  
 8 unreasonable searches and seizures and the general right to  
 9 property)

10 Plaintiff 2 incorporates each of the above paragraphs by  
 11 reference.

12 97. Defendants searched and seized<sup>8</sup>, and froze<sup>9</sup> assets of Plaintiff  
 13 2 without basis in law or fact.

14 98. Even if the suspicion in 2005 could be articulated in some  
 15 way, this suspicion had to dissipate once the United States  
 16 government sent the flow of letters and orders, starting  
 17 January 2006.

18 99. There can be therefore no justification given to the seizure  
 19 of assets in the last 18 months.

20 100. Plaintiff 2 is entitled to this Court's order to compensation  
 21 in the value of all assets traced and/or seized in value of at  
 22 least \$7.3 million and other damage according to proof.

---

23 <sup>8</sup> United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez, 494 U.S. 259: U.S. Constitution.  
 24 Amendment IV prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures whether or not  
 25 the evidence is sought to be used in a criminal trial, and a violation of  
 26 the amendment is fully accomplished at the time of an unreasonable  
 27 governmental intrusion

28 <sup>9</sup> Dayton v. Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, 266 U.S. App. D.C. 177: Under  
 international law, the date of taking is fixed by the date of the expropriation  
 decrees and/or the date of physical seizure, and not by a subsequent date of  
 repudiation of an undertaking to provide compensation

Constitutional rights rest on substance, not on form, and the liability to pay  
 compensation for property taken cannot be evaded by leaving the title in the  
 owner, while depriving him of the beneficial use of the property.

1 WHEREFORE, plaintiff 2 prays relief as set forth below.

2  
3 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **(Recovery of lost property - in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> amendment**  
5 **rights - in each of the eight countries in which the Swiss**  
6 **requested freezes and liquidation of assets by means of**  
7 **international diplomatic channels)**

8 Plaintiffs incorporate each of the above paragraphs by reference.

9 101. The funds originally held by the Hilsenraths with the Swiss  
10 banks were invested in an array of businesses in several  
11 countries.

12 102. All businesses included multiple partners.

13 103. Defendants closed those businesses and liquidated them by  
14 means of international treaties with the mentioned countries.

15 104. Plaintiffs are entitled to compensations equal to their loss  
16 of property pursuant to *California Civil Code Section 3336*<sup>10</sup> in  
17 an amount not less than \$4.5 million.

18 WHEREFORE, defendants pray relief as set forth below.

19  
20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(Recovery of lost business opportunities - in violation of 5<sup>th</sup>**  
22 **amendment rights - in each of the eight affected countries)**

23 Plaintiffs incorporate each of the above paragraphs by reference.

24 105. Plaintiffs were partners in ongoing businesses in the affected  
25 countries.

26  
27  
28  

---

<sup>10</sup>California Civil Code Section 3336: The detriment caused by the wrongful conversion of personal property is presumed to be: First--The value of the property at the time of the conversion, with the interest from that time, or, an amount sufficient to indemnify the party injured for the loss which is the natural, reasonable and proximate result of the wrongful act complained of and which a proper degree of prudence on his part would not have averted; and Second--A fair compensation for the time and money properly expended in pursuit of the property.

1 106. The businesses had long-term activities, which were disturbed  
2 by defendants' freeze and impeachment.

3 107. Plaintiffs are entitled to compensations equal to their loss  
4 of business opportunities as the result of defendants' actions  
5 according to proof in an amount not less than \$5.9 million.

6 WHEREFORE, defendants pray relief as set forth below.

7 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Hana Hilsenrath personal damage)**

9 Plaintiff Hana Hilsenrath incorporates each of the above  
10 paragraphs by reference.

11 108. Hana Hilsenrath is a mother of six children, 4 of whom are  
12 minors, and does not work outside the home.

13 109. Hana Hilsenrath has never conducted business in or with  
14 Switzerland.

15 110. Hana Hilsenrath was never accused directly or indirectly of  
16 any impropriety in any jurisdiction in the world.

17 111. Nevertheless, defendants, the Swiss government, froze her  
18 assets with no stated purpose.

19 112. As a legal result of the Swiss freeze and related actions she  
20 has suffered fear, anguish, and illness. She has seen the  
21 structure and financial security of her family threatened by  
22 the Swiss action and by the libelous slander of her family.

23 113. Hana Hilsenrath has lost the vast majority of her personal  
24 wealth. She has suffered general damages in an amount  
25 according to proof.

26 WHEREFORE, defendant Hana Hilsenrath prays relief as set forth  
27 below.  
28

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Recovery of damages as the result of breach of due process in violation of the 6<sup>th</sup> amendment)**

Plaintiffs incorporate each of the above paragraphs by reference.

114. Defendants SFAG et al. knowingly breached plaintiffs right to due process pursuant to the 6<sup>th</sup> amendment of the US Constitution.

115. By order of the US federal Court and the US government defendants were urged to release the unjustly frozen assets to allow plaintiffs legal representation in the US as well as in Switzerland.

116. Defendant boldly and repeatedly denied access to plaintiffs' funds even on a partial basis to pay attorneys.

117. While in the US the constitution allows for self-representation (which the Hilsenraths did), in Switzerland the freeze cut plaintiffs off their access to the courts.

118. As the result, plaintiffs have suffered damages in an amount according to proof.

WHEREFORE, defendants pray relief as set forth below.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Recovery of legal fees in relation to the Swiss freezes)**

Plaintiffs incorporate each of the above paragraphs by reference.

119. Before exhausting their finances, the plaintiffs incurred over \$650,000 of fees to attorneys in connection to defendant's freeze.

120. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover all legal fees incurred in relation to defendants' actions.

WHEREFORE, defendants pray relief as set forth below.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Deprivation of plaintiffs' right for liberty in re 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> amendment - arrest warrant with no due process and no charges; Swiss government's issuance of reckless Interpol arrest warrants)

Plaintiffs incorporate each of the above paragraphs by reference.

121. In or about April 2005, defendants SFAG issued an international arrest warrant for plaintiff Oliver Hilsenrath without charges or appropriate court orders.

122. The arrest warrant was broadcast through the Interpol computer system throughout 181 countries including the United States of America. The arrest warrant was broadcast throughout the world by means of a process better known as a "RED FLAG".

123. SFAG had no legal basis to issue an arrest warrant.

124. SFAG had filed no charges then, and none till this very day, against defendant Oliver Hilsenrath.

125. Mr. Hilsenrath's home is in California in the same city where the alleged fraud had occurred; he was living with his wife and 5 of their children. He was not contacted about or alerted of the 181-countries-wide arrest warrant.

126. More so, Mr. Hilsenrath agreed to travel to Switzerland several times and answer all questions the Swiss had in relation to his business and indeed did so.

127. Therefore the Swiss had no purpose, other than hurting plaintiffs financially, in issuing an arrest warrant against Mr. Hilsenrath.

128. By doing so defendant impeded plaintiffs to conduct their business and lead a normal life as guaranteed by the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

129. Mr. Hilsenrath was detained and interrogated on more than a dozen occasions in airports all around the world, including primarily in the United States, as the result of the Swiss



Interpol arrest warrant. He was ultimately released each and every time, as local authorities - all over the world - saw no clear purpose in the Swiss' "red flag".

130. Oliver Hilsenrath and the members of his family at home have continuously suffered fear and anxiety every time a business or family matter was requiring travel.

131. Plaintiffs have suffered damages in an amount according to proof.

WHEREFORE, defendants pray relief as set forth below.

#### NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**(Loss as the result of the forced liquidation of the Melanie and André Hilsenrath Trust and constructive trust - 5<sup>th</sup> amendment)**

Plaintiffs incorporate each of the above paragraphs by reference.

132. As the result of the Swiss government's freeze of the Hilsenrath assets in 8 countries, plaintiffs turned to a last resort liquidation of the Melanie and Andre Hilsenrath trust (Oliver Hilsenrath's parents).

133. \$400,000 was the entire life savings of Melanie and Andre Hilsenrath<sup>11</sup>. These funds were liquidated to aide the Hilsenraths Swiss imposed financial struggle, against the grandparents' wish for the funds to be used for the benefit of the grandchildren's higher education.

134. Plaintiffs are entitled to compensations equal to their loss of property pursuant to *California Civil Code Section 3336*<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Dr. Andre Hilsenrath, Oliver Hilsenrath father, died in April 2006.

<sup>12</sup>*California Civil Code Section 3336*: The detriment caused by the wrongful conversion of personal property is presumed to be: First--The value of the property at the time of the conversion, with the interest from that time, or, an amount sufficient to indemnify the party injured for the loss which is the natural, reasonable and proximate result of the wrongful act complained of and which a proper degree of prudence on his part would not have averted; and Second--A fair compensation for the time and money properly expended in pursuit of the property.

1 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray relief as set forth below.

2 **SCIENTER**

3 135. In addition to abovementioned courses of action, defendants  
4 Swiss Confederation, SFAG, HOLTKAMP and SAUTEBIN acted in bad  
5 faith and had clear, provable knowledge that the allegations  
6 of impropriety against plaintiffs were false and misleading.

7 136. Defendants knew or recklessly disregarded that the knowingly  
8 false and misleading accusations adversely affected the  
9 property of plaintiffs, and adversely affected their ability  
10 to conduct business, control their lives and maintain their  
11 good name and good reputation in their community.

12 137. Defendants acted knowingly to financially hurt plaintiffs.

13 **PRAYER**

14 By way of this complaint plaintiffs pray relief as follows:

15 138. That this Court order defendants to pay plaintiffs 1, 3, 4, 5,  
16 6 and 7 an amount of not less than \$7.3 million - equal to all  
their frozen/traced funds.

17 139. That this Court order defendants to further compensate  
18 plaintiff 2 for all assets that defendants froze and/or  
19 attempted to freeze in the amount of not less than \$7.3  
20 million.

21 140. That this Court order defendants to further reimburse  
22 plaintiffs the cash value of business assets liquidated in the  
23 8 affected jurisdictions in an amount no less than of \$4.5  
million.

24 141. That this Court further order defendants to compensate  
25 plaintiffs for loss of ongoing business in the 8 affected  
26 jurisdictions and beyond, in this third year of the freeze, in  
an amount no less than \$5.9 million.

27 142. That Hana Hilsenrath further recovers from defendants'  
28 personal damages according to proof.

1 143. That plaintiffs further recover damages as the result of  
2 defendants' breach of due process in violation of the 6<sup>th</sup>  
3 amendment, in both the USA and Switzerland, according to  
4 proof.

5 144. That plaintiffs further recover legal fees incurred in the  
6 relation to defendants' actions according to proof in an  
7 amount no less than \$650,000.

8 145. That plaintiffs further recover damages resulting from  
9 defendants' bogus international arrest warrants according to  
10 proof.

11 146. That the court further orders defendants to restore the funds  
12 in the Melanie and Andre Hilsenrath Trust in an amount no less  
13 than \$400,000.

14 147. That this Court award such other and further relief as it  
15 deems proper.

16 Dated: May 29, 2007

17  
18  
19 Respectfully submitted,

20  
21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_/s\_\_\_\_\_  
23 HANA HILSEN RATH

24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_/s\_\_\_\_\_  
27 OLIVER HILSEN RATH